

A Nonsmooth Optimization Approach to Robust Estimation

Laurent Bako and Henrik Ohlsson

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the problem of identifying a linear map from measurements which are subject to intermittent and arbitrarily large errors. This is a fundamental problem in many estimation-related applications such as fault detection, state estimation in lossy networks, hybrid system identification, robust estimation, etc. The problem is hard because it exhibits some intrinsic combinatorial features. Therefore, obtaining an effective solution necessitates relaxations that are both solvable at a reasonable cost and effective in the sense that they can return the true parameter vector. The current paper discusses a nonsmooth convex optimization approach. In particular, it is shown that under appropriate conditions on the data, an exact estimate can be recovered from data corrupted by a large (even infinite) number of gross errors.

Keywords. robust estimation, outliers, system identification, nonsmooth optimization.

1 Introduction

1.1 Problem and motivations

We consider a linear measurement model of the form

$$y_t = x_t^\top \theta^o + f_t + e_t \quad (1)$$

where $y_t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the measured signal, $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the regression vector, $\{e_t\}$ a sequence of *zero-mean and bounded* errors (e.g., measurement noise, model mismatch, uncertainties, etc.) and $\{f_t\}$ a sequence of *intermittent and arbitrarily large* errors. Assume that we observe the sequences $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^N$ and $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^N$ and would like to compute the parameter vector θ^o from these observations. We are interested in doing so without knowing any of the sequences $\{f_t\}$ and $\{e_t\}$. We do however make the following assumptions:

- $\{e_t\}$ is a bounded sequence.

L. Bako is with Laboratoire Ampère – Ecole Centrale de Lyon – Université de Lyon, France. E-mail: laurent.bako@ec-lyon.fr, Tel.: +33 472 186 452.

H. Ohlsson is with (a) – Department of Electrical Engineering, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden and (b) – Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California at Berkeley, CA, USA. E-mail: ohlsson@berkeley.edu

- $\{f_t\}$ is a sequence containing zeros and intermittent gross errors with (possibly) arbitrarily large magnitudes.

This is an important estimation problem arising in many situations such as fault detection, hybrid system identification, subspace clustering, error correction in communication networks. The case when $\{f_t\}$ is zero and $\{e_t\}$ is a Gaussian process has been well-studied in linear system identification theory (see, *e.g.*, the text book [23, 35]). A less studied, but very relevant scenario is when the additional perturbation $\{f_t\}$ in (1) is nonzero and contains intermittent and arbitrarily large errors. It is worth noticing the difference to the problem studied in the field of compressive sensing [6, 12, 9]. In compressive sensing, the sought parameter vector is assumed sparse and the measurement noise $\{e_t\}$, often Gaussian or bounded. Here, no assumptions are made concerning sparsity of θ^o . We will, in this contribution, study essentially the case when the data is noise-free (*i.e.*, $e_t = 0$ for all t) and $\{f_t\}$ is a sequence with intermittent gross errors. We will derive conditions for perfect recovery and provide effective algorithms for computing θ^o . In the second part of the paper, the model assumption is relaxed to allow both e_t and f_t to be simultaneously nonzero. Note that this might be a more realistic scenario since most applications have measurement noise.

For illustrative purposes, let us discuss briefly some applications where a model of the form (1) is of interest.

Switched linear system identification. A discrete-time Multi-Input Single-Output (MISO) Switched Linear System (SLS) can be written on the form

$$y_t = x_t^\top \theta_{\sigma_t}^o + e_t, \quad (2)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the regressor at time $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ defined by

$$x_t = [y_{t-1} \quad \cdots \quad y_{t-n_a} \quad u_t^\top \quad u_{t-1}^\top \quad \cdots \quad u_{t-n_b}^\top]^\top. \quad (3)$$

where $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and $y_t \in \mathbb{R}$ denote respectively the input and the output of the system. The integers n_a and n_b in (3) are the maximum output and input lags (also called the orders of the system). $\sigma_t \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ is the discrete mode (or discrete state) indexing the active subsystem at time t . σ_t is in general assumed *unobserved*. $\theta_{\sigma_t}^o \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n = n_a + n_b n_u$, is the parameter vector (PV) associated with the mode σ_t . For $\theta^o \in \{\theta_1^o, \dots, \theta_s^o\}$, the Switched Auto-Regressive eXogenous (SARX) model (2) can be written in the form (1), with unknown f_t of the following structure $f_t = x_t^\top (\theta_{\sigma_t}^o - \theta^o)$. For a background on hybrid system identification, we refer to the references [31, 16, 37, 1, 21, 25, 30, 27].

Identification from faulty data. A model of the form (1) also arises when one has to identify a linear dynamic system which is subject to intermittent sensor faults. This is the case in general when the data are transmitted over a communication network [6, 29]. Model (1) is suitable for such situations and the sequence $\{f_t\}$ then models occasional data packets losses or potential outliers. More precisely, a dynamic MISO system with process faults can be directly written in

the form (1). In the case of sensor faults, the faulty model might be defined by

$$\begin{cases} \bar{y}_t = \bar{x}_t^\top \theta^o + e_t \\ y_t = \bar{y}_t + w_t \end{cases}$$

where $y_t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the *observed output* which is affected by the fault w_t (assumed nonzero only occasionally) ; $\bar{x}_t$ is defined as in (3) from the *known input* u_t and the *unobserved output* $\bar{y}_t$. We can rewrite the faulty model exactly in the form (1) with $f_t = w_t - [w_{t-1} \ \cdots \ w_{t-n_a}] \theta^o$. Sparsity of $\{w_t\}$ induces sparsity of $\{f_t\}$ but in a lesser extent.

State estimation in the presence intermittent errors. Considering a MISO dynamic system with state dynamics described by $z_{t+1} = Az_t + Bu_t$ and observation equation $\tilde{y}_t = C^\top z_t + f_t$, (A, B, C) being known matrices of appropriate dimensions, and $\{f_t\}$ a sparse sequence of possibly very large errors, the finite horizon state estimation problem reduces to the estimation of the initial state $z_0 = \theta$. We get a model of the form (1) by setting $y_t = \tilde{y}_t - C^\top \Delta_t \bar{u}_t$ and $x_t = (A^t)^\top C$, with $\Delta_t = [A^{t-1}B \ \cdots \ AB \ B]$, $\bar{u}_t = [u_0^\top \ \cdots \ u_{t-1}^\top]^\top$. Examples of relevant works are those reported in [3, 15]. In this latter application, it can however be noted that the dataset $\{x_t\}$ may not be generic enough.¹

Connection to robust statistics. Indeed, the problem of identifying the parameters from model (1) under the announced assumptions can be viewed as a robust regression problem where the nonzero elements in the sequence $\{f_t\}$ are termed outliers. As such, it has received a lot of attention in the robust statistics literature (see, e.g., [20, 34, 24] for an overview). Examples of methods to tackle the robust estimation problem include the least absolute deviation [19], the least median of squares [33], the least trimmed squares [34], the M-estimator [20], etc. Most of these estimators come with an analysis in terms of the breakdown point [18, 14], a measure of the (asymptotic) minimum proportion of points which cause an estimator to be unbounded if they were arbitrarily corrupted by gross errors. The current report focuses on the analysis of a nonsmooth convex optimization approach which includes the least absolute deviation method as a particular case corresponding to the situation when the output in (1) is a scalar. The analysis approach taken in the current paper is different in the following sense.

- In robust statistics the quality of an estimator is measured by its breakdown point. The higher the breakdown point, the better. The available analysis is therefore directed to determining a sort of absolute robustness: how many outliers (expressed in proportion of the total number of samples) cause the estimator to become unbounded.
- Here, the question of robust performance of the estimator is posed differently. We are interested in estimating the maximum number of outliers that a nonsmooth-optimization-based estimator can accommodate while still returning the exact value one would obtain

¹In this paper, the term genericity for a dataset characterizes a notion of linear independence. For example, a set of $N > n$ data points in general linear position in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is more generic than a set of data points contained in one subspace. We will introduce different quantitative measures of data genericity in the sequel (see Definition 1 and Theorem 4).

in the absence of any outlier. This is more related to the traditional view developed in compressive sensing.

Contributions of this paper. One promising method for estimating model (1) is by nonsmooth convex optimization as suggested in [6, 1, 2]. More precisely, inspired by the recent theory of compressed sensing [6, 12, 9], the idea is to minimize a nonsmooth (and non differentiable) sum-of-norms objective function involving the fitting errors. Under noise-free assumption, such a cost function has the nice property that it is able to provide the true parameter vector in the presence of arbitrarily large errors $\{f_t\}$ provided that the number of nonzero errors is small in some sense. Of course, when the data are corrupted simultaneously by the noise $\{e_t\}$ and the gross errors $\{f_t\}$, the recovery cannot be exact any more. It is however expected (as simulations tend to suggest) that the estimate will still be close to the true one.

The current paper intends to present a new analysis of the nonsmooth optimization approach and provide some elements for further understanding its behavior. For this purpose, we start in Section 2.1 by viewing the nonsmooth optimization as the convex relaxation of a (ideal) combinatorial ℓ_0 -norm formulation. We then derive in Section 2.2 necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality. Based on those conditions we later (Section 2.3) establish new sufficient conditions for exact recovery of the true parameter vector in (1). The noisy case is treated in Section 3.2. Section 4 presents a generalization of the earlier discussions to multi-outputs systems. Finally, numerical experiments are described in Section 5 and concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

1.2 Notations

Let $\mathbb{I} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ be the index set of the measurements. For any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define a partition of the set of indices $\mathbb{I}$ by $\mathbb{I}^-(\theta) = \{t \in \mathbb{I} : \theta^\top x_t - y_t < 0\}$, $\mathbb{I}^+(\theta) = \{t \in \mathbb{I} : \theta^\top x_t - y_t > 0\}$, $\mathbb{I}^0(\theta) = \{t \in \mathbb{I} : \theta^\top x_t - y_t = 0\}$. *Cardinality of a finite set.* Throughout the paper, whenever $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite set, the notation $|\mathcal{S}|$ will refer to the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$. However, for a real number x , $|x|$ will denote the absolute value of x .

Submatrices and subvectors. Let $X = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \dots \ x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$ be the matrix formed with the available regressors $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^N$. If $I \subset \mathbb{I}$, the notation X_I denotes a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times |I|}$ formed with the columns of X indexed by I . Likewise, with $\mathbf{y} = [y_1 \ y_2 \ \dots \ y_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{y}_I$ consists of the vector in $\mathbb{R}^{|I|}$ formed with the entries of $\mathbf{y}$ indexed by I . We will use the convention that $X_I = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{y}_I = 0 \in \mathbb{R}$) when the index set I is empty.

Vector norms. $\|\cdot\|_p$, $p = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$, denote the usual p -norms for vectors defined for any vector $z = [z_1 \ \dots \ z_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$, by $\|z\|_p = (|z_1|^p + \dots + |z_N|^p)^{1/p}$. Note that $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} |x_i|$. The ℓ_0 "norm" of z is defined to be the number of nonzero entries in z , i.e., $\|z\|_0 = |\{i : z_i \neq 0\}|$.

Matrix norms. The following matrix norms will be used: $\|\cdot\|_p$, $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$, $\|\cdot\|_{2, \text{col}}$, $\|\cdot\|_{2, \infty}$,

$\|\cdot\|_{\max}$. They are defined as follows: for a matrix $A = [a_1 \ \cdots \ a_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_p &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \|x\|_p=1} \|Ax\|_p, \quad \|A\|_{2,\text{col}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \|a_i\|_2, \\ \|A\|_{2,\infty} &= \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \|a_i\|_2, \quad \|A\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |A_{ij}| \end{aligned}$$

with A_{ij} denoting the entries of A .

2 Nonsmooth optimization for the estimation problem

2.1 Sparse optimization

The main idea for identifying the parameter vector θ^o is by solving a sparse optimization problem, that is, a problem which involves the minimization of the number of nonzero entries in the error vector. To be more specific, assume for the time being that the error sequence $\{e_t\}$ is identically equal to zero. Consider a candidate parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let

$$\phi(\theta) = \mathbf{y} - X^\top \theta,$$

where $\mathbf{y} = [y_1 \ \cdots \ y_N]^\top$, $X = [x_1 \ \cdots \ x_N]$, be the fitting error vector induced by θ on the experimental data. Then the identification of θ^o can be written in the form of an ℓ_0 objective minimization problem as

$$\underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{minimize}} \|\phi(\theta)\|_0 \quad (4)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_0$ denotes the ℓ_0 (pseudo) norm which counts the number of nonzero entries. Because problem (4) aims at making the error $\phi(\theta)$ sparse by minimizing the number of nonzero elements (or maximizing the number of zeros), it is sometimes called a sparse optimization problem [1]. As can be intuitively guessed, the recoverability of the true parameter vector θ^o from (4) depends naturally on some properties of the available data. This is outlined by the following lemma.

Lemma 1 (A sufficient condition for ℓ_0 recovery). *Assume that $\{e_t\}$ is equal to zero and let $\mathbf{f} = [f_1 \ \cdots \ f_N]^\top$. Assume that for any $I \subset \mathbb{I}$ with $|I| > n$, $\mathbf{f}_I \notin \text{im}(X_I^\top)$ whenever $\mathbf{f}_I \neq 0$, with $\text{im}(\cdot)$ referring here to range space. Then provided $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)| > n$, it holds that*

$$\theta^o \in \arg \min_{\theta} \|\phi(\theta)\|_0. \quad (5)$$

Proof. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that (5) does not hold, i.e., $\min_{\theta} \|\phi(\theta)\|_0 < \|\phi(\theta^o)\|_0$. Then, by letting θ^m be any vector in $\arg \min_{\theta} \|\phi(\theta)\|_0$, the above inequality translates into $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)| > |\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)| > n$. It follows that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)} \neq 0$ because $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)| = |\{t \in \mathbb{I} : f_t = 0\}|$ is the exact (largest) number of zero elements in the sequence $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^N$. Note also that we have necessarily $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)| > n$. On the other hand, with $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)} = X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)}^\top \theta^m = X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)}^\top \theta^o + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)}$, it can be seen that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)} = X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)}^\top (\theta^m - \theta^o) \in \text{im}(X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)}^\top)$. This, together with $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^m)} \neq 0$,

constitutes a contradiction to the assumption of the Lemma. Hence, (5) holds as claimed. $\square$

Lemma 1 specifies a condition involving both X and $\mathbf{f}$ and under which θ^o lies in the solution set but it does not ensure that θ^o will be recovered uniquely from data. Before proceeding further, we recall from [1] a sufficient condition under which θ^o is the unique solution to (4).

Definition 1 (An integer measure of genericity). *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$ be a data matrix satisfying $\text{rank}(X) = n$. The n -genericity index of X denoted $\nu_n(X)$, is defined as the minimum integer m such that any $n \times m$ submatrix of X has rank n ,*

$$\nu_n(X) = \min \left\{ m : \forall \mathcal{S} \subset I \text{ with } |\mathcal{S}| = m, \text{rank}(X_{\mathcal{S}}) = n \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Theorem 1 (Sufficient condition for ℓ_0 recovery). *Assume that the sequence $\{e_t\}$ in (1) is identically equal to zero. If the sequence $\{f_t\}$ in (1) contains enough zero values in the sense that*

$$|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)| = |\{t \in \mathbb{I} : f_t = 0\}| \geq \frac{N + \nu_n(X)}{2}, \quad (7)$$

then θ^o is the unique solution to the ℓ_0 -norm minimization problem (4).

Proof. A proof of this result can be found in [1]. $\square$

In other words, if the number of nonzero gross errors $\{f_t\}$ affecting the data generated by (1) does not exceed the threshold $(N - \nu_n(X))/2$, then θ^o can be exactly recovered by solving (4). Unfortunately, this problem is a hard combinatorial optimization problem. A more tractable solution can be obtained by relaxing the ℓ_0 -norm into its best convex approximant, the ℓ_1 -norm. Doing this substitution in (4) gives

$$\underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{minimize}} \|\phi(\theta)\|_1 = \sum_{t=1}^N |y_t - \theta^\top x_t|. \quad (8)$$

The latter problem is termed a nonsmooth convex optimization problem [26, Chap. 3] because the objective function is convex but non-differentiable. Compared to (4), problem (8) has the advantage of being convex and can hence be efficiently solved by many existing numerical solvers, *e.g.*, [17]. Note further that it can be written as a linear programming problem. The ℓ_1 relaxation process has been intensively used in the compressed sensing literature [13] for approaching the sparsest solution of an underdetermined set of linear equations. As will be shown next, the underlying reason why problem (8) can obtain the true parameter vector despite the presence of gross perturbations $\{f_t\}$ is related to its nonsmoothness.

2.2 Solution to the ℓ_1 problem

A number of sufficient conditions for the equivalence of problems similar to (4) and (8) have been derived in the literature of compressed sensing using the concepts of mutual coherence [13] and the Restricted Isometry Property [7]. Here, we shall propose a parallel but different analysis for

the robust estimation problem. We start by characterizing the solution to the ℓ_1 -norm problem (8).

Theorem 2 (Solution to the ℓ_1 problem). *A vector $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ solves the ℓ_1 -norm problem (8) iff any of the following equivalent statements hold:*

S1. There exist some numbers $\lambda_t \in [-1, 1]$, $t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)$, such that²

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)} x_t - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*)} x_t = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} \lambda_t x_t. \quad (9)$$

S2. For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\left| \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)} \eta^\top x_t - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*)} \eta^\top x_t \right| \leq \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} |\eta^\top x_t|. \quad (10)$$

S3. The optimal value of the optimization problem

$$\min_{\alpha} \|\alpha\|_{\infty} \quad \text{subject to } z = X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} \alpha, \quad (11)$$

where $z = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)} x_t - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*)} x_t$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)|}$, is less than or equal to 1.

Moreover, the solution θ^* is unique iff

S1'. (9) holds and $\text{rank}(X_S) = n$ where

$$S = \{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*) : |\lambda_t| < 1\}.$$

S2'. (10) holds with strict inequality symbol for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\eta \neq 0$.

Proof. Proof of S1. Since $\|\phi(\theta)\|_1$ is a proper convex function, it has a non empty subdifferential [32]. The necessary and sufficient condition for θ^* to be a solution of (8) is then

$$0 \in \partial \|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1,$$

where the notation ∂ refers to subdifferential with respect to θ . Indeed, using additivity of subdifferentials, it is straightforward to write

$$\partial \|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1 = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)} x_t - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*)} x_t + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} \text{conv} \{-x_t, x_t\} \quad (12)$$

where conv refers to the convex hull. Here, the addition symbol is meant in the Minkowski sum sense. It follows that $0 \in \partial \|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1$ is equivalent to the existence of a set of numbers λ_t in $[-1, 1]$, $t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)$, such that (9) holds.

²Eq. (9) should be understood here with the implicit convention that any of the three terms is equal to zero whenever the corresponding index set is empty.

Proof of S2. Define two functions $q, h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by $q(\theta) = \sum_{t \notin \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} |y_t - \theta^\top x_t|$ and $h(\theta) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} |y_t - \theta^\top x_t|$. Then $\|\phi(\theta)\|_1 = q(\theta) + h(\theta)$ and q is differentiable at θ^* . It follows that $\partial \|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1 = \nabla q(\theta^*) + \partial h(\theta^*)$, where $\nabla q(\theta^*)$ is the gradient of q at θ^* . We can hence write

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* \text{ minimizes } \|\phi(\theta)\|_1 &\Leftrightarrow 0 \in \partial \|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow -\nabla q(\theta^*) \in \partial h(\theta^*). \end{aligned}$$

Note from (12) that $\partial h(\theta^*) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} \text{conv} \{-x_t, x_t\}$ so that $-\nabla q(\theta^*) \in \partial h(\theta^*)$ iff $\pm \nabla q(\theta^*) \in \partial h(\theta^*)$ and this in turn is equivalent to $g^\top (\theta - \theta^*) \leq h(\theta) - h(\theta^*) \forall \theta$, for $g \in \{-\nabla q(\theta^*), +\nabla q(\theta^*)\}$. It follows that θ^* minimizes $\|\phi(\theta)\|_1$ iff

$$\left| \nabla q(\theta^*)^\top (\theta - \theta^*) \right| \leq h(\theta) - h(\theta^*) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)} \left| (\theta - \theta^*)^\top x_t \right| \quad (13)$$

for all θ . The last equality is obtained by using the fact that $y_t - x_t^\top \theta^* = 0$ for all t in $\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)$. Finally the result follows by setting $\eta = \theta - \theta^*$ and noting that $\nabla q(\theta^*) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)} x_t - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*)} x_t$.

S1 $\Leftrightarrow$ S3. The proof of the last equivalence is immediate.

Uniqueness. For convenience, we first prove S2'. Along the lines of the proof of S2 (see Eq. (13) and preceding arguments), we can see that strict inequality in (10) is equivalent to the following strict inequality $-\nabla q(\theta^*)^\top (\theta - \theta^*) < h(\theta) - h(\theta^*) \quad \forall \theta \neq \theta^*$. On the other hand, $\nabla q(\theta^*)^\top (\theta - \theta^*) \leq q(\theta) - q(\theta^*) \quad \forall \theta$. Summing the two yields

$$\|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1 = q(\theta^*) + h(\theta^*) < q(\theta) + h(\theta) = \|\phi(\theta)\|_1 \quad \forall \theta \neq \theta^*.$$

Hence S2' is proved.

For the proof of S1', we proceed in two steps.

Sufficiency. Assume $\text{rank}(X_S) = n$. Then for any nonzero vector $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is at least one $t_0 \in S$ such that $\eta^\top x_{t_0} \neq 0$. Recall that $|\lambda_{t_0}| < 1$ by definition of S . It follows that by multiplying (9) on the left by $\eta^\top$ with $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ an arbitrary nonzero vector, and taking the absolute value yields (10) with strict inequality symbol. We can therefore apply the proof of S2' to conclude that θ^* is unique.

Necessity. Assume $\text{rank}(X_S) < n$. Then pick any nonzero vector η in $\ker(X_S^\top)$. Set $\eta_1 = \nu \eta$ with $\nu \neq 0$. Indeed ν can be chosen sufficiently small such that $x_t^\top (\theta^* + \eta_1) - y_t$ has the same sign as $x_t^\top \theta^* - y_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*) \cup \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)$. This implies that $\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*) \subset \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^* + \eta_1)$ and $\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*) \subset \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^* + \eta_1)$. Moreover, since $\eta_1 \in \ker(X_S^\top)$, $x_t^\top (\theta^* + \eta_1) - y_t = \eta_1^\top x_t = 0 \quad \forall t \in S$, so that $S \subset \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^* + \eta_1)$. Finally, it remains to re-assign the indices t contained in $\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*) \setminus S$ for which $\lambda_t = 1$. We get the following partition $\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^* + \eta_1) = \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*) \cup \{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*) : \eta_1^\top x_t > 0\}$, $\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^* + \eta_1) = \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*) \cup \{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*) : \eta_1^\top x_t < 0\}$, $\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^* + \eta_1) = S \cup \{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*) : \eta_1^\top x_t = 0\}$. It follows that $\theta^* + \eta_1 \neq \theta^*$ also satisfies (9) with the sequence $\{\lambda_t\}_{t \in S}$ and is therefore a minimizer. In conclusion, if $\text{rank}(X_S) < n$, the minimizer cannot be unique. $\square$

A number of important comments follow from Theorem 2.

- One first consequence of the theorem is that θ^o can be computed exactly from a finite set of erroneous data (by solving problem (8)) provided it satisfies the conditions S1' or S2' of the theorem. Note that there is no explicit boundedness condition imposed on the error sequence $\{f_t\}$. Hence the nonzero errors in this sequence can have arbitrarily large magnitudes as long as the optimization problem makes sense, *i.e.*, provided $\|\phi(\theta^*)\|_1$ remains finite.
- Second, θ^o can be exactly recovered in the presence of, say, infinitely many nonzero errors f_t (see also Proposition 1). For example, if the regressors $\{x_t\}$ satisfy

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)} x_t - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)} x_t = 0,$$

and $\text{rank}(X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)}) = n$, then θ^o is the unique solution to problem (8) regardless of the number of errors affecting the data.

- Third, if problem (8) admits a solution θ^* that satisfies $y_t - x_t^\top \theta^* \neq 0$ for all $t = 1, \dots, N$, then θ^* is non-unique. In effect, $\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*) = \emptyset$ in this case and so, $\text{rank}(X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)}) = 0 < n$ which, by Theorem 2, implies non-uniqueness. Indeed this is typically the case whenever the noise $\{e_t\}$ is nonzero.

Another immediate consequence of Theorem 2 can be stated as follows.

Corollary 1 (On the special case of affine model). *If the model (1) is affine in the sense that the regressor x_t has the form $x_t = [\tilde{x}_t^\top \ 1]^\top$, with $\tilde{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, then a necessary condition for θ^* to solve problem (8) is that*

$$\left| |\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^*)| - |\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^*)| \right| \leq |\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^*)|. \quad (14)$$

Here, the outer bars $|\cdot|$ refer to absolute value while the inner ones which apply to sets refer to cardinality.

Proof. The proof is immediate by considering the condition (10) and taking $\eta = [\mathbf{0}^\top \ 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$. $\square$

Eq. (14) implies that if the measurement model is affine and all the f_t 's have the same sign, *i.e.*, if one of the cardinalities $|\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)|$ or $|\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)|$ is equal to zero, then problem (8) cannot find the true θ^o whenever more than 50% of the elements of the sequence $\{f_t\}$ are nonzero.

Next, we discuss a special case in which the true parameter vector θ^o in (1) can, in principle, be obtained asymptotically in the presence of an infinite number of nonzero errors f_t 's.

Proposition 1 (Infinite number of outliers). *Assume that the error sequence $\{e_t\}$ in (1) is identically equal to zero. Assume further that the data are generated such that:*

- *There is a set I^0 with $|I^0| \geq n$, such that for any $t \in I^0$, $f_t = 0$ and $\text{rank}(X_{I^0}) = n$,*
- *For any $t \notin I^0$, f_t is sampled from a distribution which is symmetric around zero.*

- The regression vector sequence $\{x_t\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is drawn from a probability distribution having a finite first moment.

Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N |y_t - x_t^\top \theta| = \{\theta^o\} \quad (15)$$

with probability one.

Proof. Under the conditions of the proposition, we have $\text{Prob}(y_t - x_t^\top \theta^o < 0) = \text{Prob}(y_t - x_t^\top \theta^o > 0) = 1/2$, where Prob denotes probability measure. It follows that $|\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)|$ go jointly to infinity as the total number of samples N tends to infinity. Hence, the expressions $\frac{1}{|\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)|} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)} x_t$ and $\frac{1}{|\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)|} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)} x_t$ are both sample estimates for the expectation of the process $\{x_t\}$. By the law of large numbers, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the two quantities converge to the true expectation of the process $\{x_t\}$ with probability one, so that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{1}{|\mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)|} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^+(\theta^o)} x_t - \frac{1}{|\mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)|} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^-(\theta^o)} x_t \right] = 0.$$

As a consequence, θ^o satisfies condition S1' of Theorem 2 asymptotically with $\lambda_t = 0$ for any $t \in \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o) = I^0$. Hence the solution of the ℓ_1 minimization problem tends to θ^o with probability one as the number of samples approaches infinity. $\square$

2.3 Sufficient conditions for recoverability by convex optimization

In this section we derive sufficient conditions under which θ^o in model (1) belongs to the solution set of problem (8). The conditions say essentially that if the number of zero entries in vector $\mathbf{f}$ is larger than certain thresholds depending on the data matrix X , then θ^o solves (8). To some extent, the thresholds can be interpreted as quantitative measures of the richness (genericity) of X . Our derivations rely on Theorem 2.

We start by introducing the following notations :

$$v_1(k) = \max_{(I, I^c): |I|=k \geq \nu_n(X)} \left\| X_I^\top (X_I X_I^\top)^{-1} X_{I^c} \right\|_\infty \quad (16)$$

$$v_2(k) = \max_{(I, I^c): |I|=k} \left\| X_{I^c}^\top (X X^\top)^{-1} X \right\|_1, \quad (17)$$

where the maximum is taken over the set of those partitions (I, I^c) of $\mathbb{I}$ that satisfy $|I| = k$. In addition, let

$$k_1(X) = \min_{k \in \mathbb{I}, k \geq \nu_n(X)} \{k : v_1(k) \leq 1\} \quad (18)$$

and

$$k_2(X) = \min_{k \in \mathbb{I}} \{k : v_2(k) \leq 1/2\}. \quad (19)$$

Assuming that $\text{rank}(X) = n$, it can be seen that the numbers $k_i(X)$, $i = 1, 2$, are well-defined. First, note that $\nu_n(X) \leq N$ so that the condition $k_i(X) \geq \nu_n(X)$ is achievable. Moreover, by

considering the trivial partition (I, I^c) with $I = \mathbb{I}$ and $I^c = \emptyset$, we see that a possible (the largest indeed) value for $k_i(X)$ is N .

Theorem 3 (Sufficient condition for exact recovery). *Suppose that the sequence $\{e_t\}$ in model (1) is zero and $\text{rank}(X) = n$. Then any vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ obeying*

$$|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| \geq \min(k_1(X), k_2(X)) \quad (20)$$

solves the ℓ_1 minimization problem (8).

If in addition, all inequalities involved in the definition of $k_1(X)$ and $k_2(X)$ are strict, then θ is the unique solution to (8).

Proof. Part 1. We will show that if $v_1(k) \leq 1$ for some $k \geq \nu_n(X)$, then any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| \geq k$ solves problem (8). Assume $v_1(k) \leq 1$ and break the proof into two cases.

First case : $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| = k$.

Let $I = \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$ and $I^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$. Then θ solves problem (8) if it satisfies Condition S3 of Theorem 2. In turn, a sufficient condition for S3 is

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|}} \left\{ \|\alpha\|_\infty : X_{I^c} h = X_I \alpha \right\} \leq 1 \quad (21)$$

for any $h \in \{\pm 1\}^{|I^c|}$. Let p^* be the optimal value of problem (21) for a fixed but arbitrary h and pose

$$\alpha^* = \arg \min_{\alpha} \{ \|\alpha\|_2 \text{ s.t. } X_{I^c} h = X_I \alpha \}.$$

Since α^* is a feasible point for problem (21), we see that $\|\alpha^*\|_\infty \leq 1$ is a sufficient condition for $p^* \leq 1$. The so-defined α^* is the well-known least euclidean-norm solution to an underdetermined system of linear equations [4]; α^* can be analytically expressed as $\alpha^* = X_I^\top (X_I X_I^\top)^{-1} X_{I^c} h$. As a consequence, we get a more restrictive sufficient condition as $\|X_I^\top (X_I X_I^\top)^{-1} X_{I^c}\|_\infty \|h\|_\infty \leq 1$ which can be rewritten more simply as $\|X_I^\top (X_I X_I^\top)^{-1} X_{I^c}\|_\infty \leq 1$ since $\|h\|_\infty = 1$. It follows that if $v_1(k) \leq 1$, then any θ satisfying $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| = k$ solves problem (8).

Second case : $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| > k$.

Set $J = \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$ and $J^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$. Without loss of generality, J can be decomposed in the form $J = I \cup \{x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{|J|}\}$ where I is a subset of $\mathbb{I}$ such that $|I| = k$. Then by posing $I^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus I$, we have $I^c = J^c \cup \{x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{|J|}\}$. By exploiting the definition of v_1 in (16) together with the assumption $v_1(k) \leq 1$ and the fact that $|I| = k$, we see that $\|X_I^\top (X_I X_I^\top)^{-1} X_{I^c}\|_\infty \leq 1$. This, as argued in the *first case* studied above, is a sufficient condition for (I, I^c) to satisfy (21). Hence by setting

$$\alpha_I^o = \arg \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|}} \left\{ \|\alpha\|_\infty : X_{I^c} h = X_I \alpha \right\}$$

for an arbitrary $h \in \{\pm 1\}^{N-k}$, it holds that $X_{I^c} h = X_I \alpha_I^o$ and $\|\alpha_I^o\|_\infty \leq 1$. Let us partition h in the form $h = [h_1^\top \ h_2^\top]^\top$ where h_1 and h_2 are vectors of lengths $N - |J|$ and $|J| - k$ respectively.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} X_{I^c}h &= X_I\alpha_I^o \Leftrightarrow X_{J^c}h_1 + [x_{k+1} \ \dots \ x_{|J|}]h_2 = X_I\alpha_I^o \\ &\Leftrightarrow X_{J^c}h_1 = X_J \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_I^o \\ -h_2 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where it can be observed that $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_I^o \\ -h_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty = 1$. Since $h \in \{\pm 1\}^{N-k}$ is arbitrary, it can be concluded that

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}} \left\{ \|\alpha\|_\infty : X_{J^c}h = X_J\alpha \right\} \leq 1$$

for any $h \in \{\pm 1\}^{|J^c|}$. As already pointed out, this is a sufficient condition for θ to be a solution of problem (8). In conclusion, θ solves (8) whenever $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| \geq k_1(X)$ as claimed.

Part 2. Assume that $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| \geq k_2(X)$. Let us start by observing that v_2 defined in (16) is a decreasing function of k . Then, by setting $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| = k$ and exploiting the definition of $k_2(X)$, it holds that $v_2(k) \leq 1/2$. Pose $I = \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$ and $I^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$. By following a similar reasoning as in Part 1, we just need to show that $\|X_{I^c}^\top (XX^\top)^{-1}X\|_1 \leq 1/2$ is a sufficient condition for θ to solve (8). For this purpose, note from the condition S2 of Theorem 2 that for θ to be a minimizer of (8), it suffices that

$$\sum_{t \in I^c} |\eta^\top x_t| \leq \sum_{t \in I} |\eta^\top x_t| \quad (22)$$

for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By adding the term $\sum_{t \in I^c} |\eta^\top x_t|$ on both sides of the inequality symbol, it follows that

$$\sum_{t \in I^c} |\eta^\top x_t| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|X^\top \eta\|_1.$$

It is therefore enough that

$$\max_{\|X^\top \eta\|_1=1} \|X_{I^c}^\top \eta\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (23)$$

where the maximum is taken with respect to $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By letting $b = X^\top \eta$ and hence replacing η with $\eta = (XX^\top)^{-1}Xb$, the previous condition becomes

$$\max_{\|b\|_1=1} \|X_{I^c}^\top (XX^\top)^{-1}Xb\|_1 \leq 1/2$$

or

$$\|X_{I^c}^\top (XX^\top)^{-1}X\|_1 \leq 1/2. \quad (24)$$

This concludes the proof of the first statement.

Uniqueness. The uniqueness follows in a similar way as in Part 1 and Part 2 above by invoking conditions S1' and S2' respectively.

- In effect, Eq. (20) implies that $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)| \geq k_1(X) \geq \nu_n(X)$ so that $\text{rank}(X_{\mathbb{I}^0(\theta)}) = n$. On the other hand, if $k_1(X)$ is defined in (18) with strict inequality, then by following the logic of Part 1 (first case), it can be seen that (21) holds with strict inequality as well for $I = \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$

and $I^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$. Hence condition S1' is fulfilled, so that Theorem 2 provides uniqueness of θ .

- If $k_2(X)$ is defined with strict inequality then Eq. (20) implies that (24) holds with strict inequality for $I = \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$ and $I^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta)$. This implies (22), which in turn is a sufficient condition for S2'. Uniqueness of θ follows from Theorem 2.

□

The conditions proposed in Theorem 3 are only sufficient and hence necessarily conservative. To get a sense of how conservative those conditions are, it would be useful to be able to compute the thresholds $k_1(X)$ and $k_2(X)$. However these numbers are very hard to evaluate numerically because of the underlying combinatorial optimization involved in their computation. Next we investigate another sufficient condition for the solution of (8) to coincide with θ^o . This last condition is more restrictive than those of Theorem 3 in the sense that the corresponding threshold is an upper bound on $k_1(X)$ and $k_2(X)$. But the new threshold has the important advantage of being easily computable.

Theorem 4 (Another sufficient condition). *Assume that the sequence of errors $\{e_t\}$ is zero in (2) and that $\text{rank}(X) = n$. Define the number*

$$\begin{aligned} r(X) &= \max_{(k,t) \in \mathbb{I}^2} \left| x_k^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} x_t \right| \\ &= \|X^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} X\|_{\max} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

If

$$|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)| > N - \frac{1}{2r(X)}, \quad (26)$$

with $|\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)|$ denoting the cardinality of $\mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)$, then θ^o is the unique minimizer of (8).

Proof. The proof follows by similar arguments as in Part 3 of the proof of Theorem 3 with the slight difference that the uniqueness condition S2' (see Theorem 2) is invoked. For θ^o to be the unique minimizer of (8), it is sufficient that (24) holds with strict inequality symbol and $I^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)$. Now we use the fact that the 1-norm of a matrix is the maximum of the 1-norms of its columns:

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{I^c}^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} X\|_1 &= \max_{t=1,\dots,N} \|X_{I^c}^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} x_t\|_1 \\ &= \max_{t=1,\dots,N} \sum_{k \in I^c} \left| x_k^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} x_t \right| \\ &\leq |I^c| r(X). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore a sufficient condition for θ^o to be the unique solution of (8) is that $|I^c| r(X) < 1/2$. The conclusion follows immediately. □

Theorem 4 says that under noise-free assumption, if the number of zero entries in $\mathbf{f}$ is larger than a certain threshold (depending on the degree of genericity of the data), then the true

parameter vector θ^o can be computed efficiently by solving the convex problem (8). It follows from (26) that it is desirable to have $r(X)$ be as small as possible. This is indeed a property of richness on the measured data matrix X . The richer the regressors $\{x_t\}$, the smaller $r(X)$.

Theorem 5 (ℓ_0/ℓ_1 equivalence). *If a parameter vector $\theta^o \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies condition (26), then it is the unique solution to both the ℓ_0 problem (4) and the ℓ_1 problem (8).*

Proof. If θ^o satisfies condition (26), then by applying Eq. (27) proved below in Lemma 2, it is easy to see that $\|\phi(\theta^o)\|_0 < 1/2(N - \nu_n(X) + 1)$. This last condition holds iff θ^o satisfies (7). Hence θ^o satisfies both the conditions of Theorem 1 and Theorem 4. The result to be proved follows. $\square$

We conclude this section with a few technical remarks concerning some interesting properties of $r(X)$.

Lemma 2 (Some properties of $r(X)$). *Under the assumption that $\text{rank}(X) = n$, $r(X)$ satisfies :*

$$1/r(X) \leq N - \nu_n(X) + 1. \quad (27)$$

$$N - \frac{1}{2r(X)} \geq k_2(X). \quad (28)$$

Proof. Proof of (27): We know from the proof of Theorem 4 (see also Part 2 in the proof of Theorem 3) that

$$r(X) \geq \frac{1}{|I|} \left\| X_I^\top (X X^\top)^{-1} X \right\|_1 = \frac{1}{|I|} \max_{\eta \neq 0} \frac{\|X_I^\top \eta\|_1}{\|X^\top \eta\|_1}$$

for any $I \subset \mathbb{I}$. A special case is when the subset I is a singleton of the form $I = \{q\}$. For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $T(\eta) = \text{supp}(X^\top \eta) = \{t \in \mathbb{I} : x_t^\top \eta \neq 0\}$. When $\eta \neq 0$, consider an index $q(\eta)$ such that $q(\eta) \in \arg \max_{k \in T(\eta)} |x_k^\top \eta|$. Then by applying the above inequality with $I = \{q(\eta)\}$, we get

$$r(X) \geq \max_{\eta \neq 0} \frac{|x_{q(\eta)}^\top \eta|}{\|X_{T(\eta)}^\top \eta\|_1} \geq \max_{\eta \neq 0} \frac{1}{|T(\eta)|}$$

with $|T(\eta)|$ standing for the cardinality of $T(\eta)$. When $\eta \neq 0$, the smallest value $|T(\eta)|$ can take is $N - \nu_n(X) + 1$ where $\nu_n(X)$ is the number defined by Eq. (6). It can therefore be concluded that $r(X) \geq 1/(N - \nu_n(X) + 1)$ which is equivalent to (27).

Proof of (28): Let (I, I^c) be a partition of $\mathbb{I}$ and set $k = N - 1/(2r(X))$. First note that

$$|I| \geq k \Rightarrow |I^c| r(X) \leq 1/2.$$

On the other hand, we know (from the proof of Theorem 4) that

$$\|X_{I^c}^\top (X X^\top)^{-1} X\|_1 \leq |I^c| r(X).$$

It follows that $|I| \geq k \Rightarrow \|X_{I^c}^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} X\|_1 \leq 1/2$ and hence $v_2(k) \leq 1/2$. By invoking the definition of the number $k_2(X)$ in (19), it can be concluded that $k \geq k_2(X)$. $\square$

Remark 1. For any nonsingular matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $r(TX) = r(X)$, $k_1(TX) = k_1(X)$ and $k_2(TX) = k_2(X)$. It follows that the numbers $r(X)$ and $k_i(X)$, $i = 1, 2$ depend only on the subspace spanned by the rows of the regressor matrix X .

3 Some implementation aspects

3.1 Enforcing recoverability by the ℓ_1 norm minimization

The parameter vector θ^o from the model (1) can be uniquely recovered by solving the convex problem (8) if θ^o satisfies, for example, condition (26) of Theorem 4. In case this condition is not naturally satisfied, an interesting question is how we can process the data in order to promote it. In this section we discuss an algorithmic strategy for enhancing the recoverability of θ^o by ℓ_1 minimization. Our discussion is inspired by [8]. The idea is to solve a sequence of problems of the type (8) with different weights computed iteratively [8, 1]. The iterative scheme can be defined for a fixed number $r_{\max}$ of iterations as follows. At iteration $r = 0, \dots, r_{\max}$, compute

$$\theta^{(r)} = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{t=1}^N w_t^{(r)} \left| y_t - \theta^\top x_t \right|, \quad (29)$$

with weights defined, for all t , by $w_t^{(0)} = 1/N$, and

$$w^{(r)}(t) = \frac{\xi_t^{(r)}}{\sum_{t=1}^N \xi_t^{(r)}}, \quad \text{if } r \geq 1,$$

where

$$\xi_t^{(r)} = \frac{1}{|y_t - x_t^\top \theta^{(r-1)}| + \delta},$$

with $\delta > 0$ a small number whose role is to prevent division by zero and r is the iteration number. Note that there are many other reweighting strategies which can be used in (29), see *e.g.*, [11, 38, 22]. Since we are dealing here with a sequence of convex optimization problems, they can be numerically implemented using any convex solver. In particular the **CVX** software package [17] solves efficiently this category of problems in a Matlab environment.

3.2 On the treatment of the noise $\{e_t\}$

The formulations (4) and (8) are convenient when the noise $\{e_t\}$ is equal to zero. Nevertheless, they are expected to work in the presence of a moderate amount of noise. To take explicitly the noise $\{e_t\}$ into account, we propose to compute estimates $\hat{e} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (of e and f respectively) by minimizing a cost of the form $\|\hat{e}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\varphi\|_0$ under an equality constraint of the

form (1). In other words, we consider the problem

$$\underset{(\theta, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^N}{\text{minimize}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - X^\top \theta - \varphi\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\varphi\|_0 \right] \quad (30)$$

and its convex relaxation,

$$\underset{(\theta, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^N}{\text{minimize}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - X^\top \theta - \varphi\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\varphi\|_1 \right]. \quad (31)$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a regularization parameter.

Lemma 3. *A pair $(\theta^*, \varphi^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^N$ solves (31) iff it satisfies*

$$XX^\top \theta^* - X(\mathbf{y} - \varphi^*) = 0 \quad (32)$$

$$X^\top \theta^* - (\mathbf{y} - \varphi^*) = -\lambda s(\varphi^*), \quad (33)$$

where $s(\varphi^*)$ is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^N$ whose entries $s_t(\varphi^*)$, $t = 1, \dots, N$, are defined by: $s_t(\varphi^*) = \text{sign}(\varphi_t^*)$ if $\varphi_t^* \neq 0$ and $s_t(\varphi^*) \in [-1, 1]$ if $\varphi_t^* = 0$.

Proof. Let $l(\theta, \varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - X^\top \theta - \varphi\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\varphi\|_1$ be the objective function of the problem (31). Then l is a proper convex function which is differentiable with respect to variable θ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and admits a subdifferential at any variable $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^N$. (θ^*, φ^*) minimizes $l(\theta, \varphi)$ iff $0 = \nabla_\theta l(\theta^*, \varphi^*)$ and $0 \in \partial_\varphi l(\theta^*, \varphi^*)$. These conditions translate immediately into $XX^\top \theta^* - X(\mathbf{y} - \varphi^*) = 0$ and $-(\mathbf{y} - \varphi^* - X^\top \theta^*) + \lambda s(\varphi^*) = 0$, where $s(\varphi^*) \in \partial \|\varphi^*\|_1$ is a subgradient of $\|\varphi\|_1$ at φ^* . $\square$

It is interesting to note that (32)-(33) imply $Xs(\varphi^*) = 0$, which is very similar to (9). The following lemma characterizes the uniqueness of the solution of (31).

Lemma 4 (Uniqueness of solution to (31)). *A pair (θ^*, φ^*) is the unique solution to problem (31) iff both of the following statements are true*

(i) (θ^*, φ^*) satisfies conditions (32)-(33) for some $s(\varphi^*) \in \partial \|\varphi^*\|_1$

(ii) $\text{rank}(X) = n$ and $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = |\mathcal{S}^c|$.

Here, $\Psi = I_N - X^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} X$, with I_N being the identity matrix of order N , $\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ is a matrix formed with the columns of Ψ indexed by $\mathcal{S}^c$ defined by $\mathcal{S}^c = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathcal{S}$, with $\mathcal{S} = \{t \in \mathbb{I} : |s_t(\varphi^*)| < 1\}$.

The expression of (θ^*, φ^*) is then given by:

$$\theta^* = (XX^\top)^{-1} X(\mathbf{y} - \varphi^*), \quad (34)$$

If $|\mathcal{S}^c| = 0$, then $\varphi^* = 0$, otherwise

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{S}^c}^* = \left(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c} \right)^{-1} \Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top (\Psi \mathbf{y} - \lambda s(\varphi^*)), \quad \varphi_{\mathcal{S}}^* = 0. \quad (35)$$

Proof. $l(\theta, \varphi)$ is a quadratic function of θ . For a fixed φ^* , the minimizer θ^* of $l(\theta, \varphi^*)$ is unique iff X has full row rank, i.e., $\text{rank}(X) = n$. The unique value of θ^* is expressed in function of φ^* by (34). Plugging the expression (34) of θ^* in the objective gives

$$\tilde{l}(\varphi) \triangleq l(\theta^*, \varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \|\Psi \mathbf{y} - \Psi \varphi\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\varphi\|_1.$$

The rest of the proof then boils down to showing that the minimizer φ^* of $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$ is unique iff $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = |\mathcal{S}^c|$. To begin with, let us point out the following (see also³ [36]). If φ^* and ξ^* are two minimizers of $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$, then we have necessarily

$$\Psi \varphi^* = \Psi \xi^* \tag{36}$$

$$s(\varphi^*) = s(\xi^*). \tag{37}$$

The relation (36) follows from the strict convexity of $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$ as a function of $\Psi \varphi$. In effect, by changing the optimization variable into $\delta = \Psi \varphi$, $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$ becomes $\frac{1}{2} \|\Psi \mathbf{y} - \delta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\Psi^\dagger \delta + v\|_1$, with v a vector in $\ker(\Psi)$ and $\dagger$ referring to generalized inverse. This last function is strictly convex with respect to δ . As a consequence, its minimizer is unique and equal to $\delta^* = \Psi \varphi^*$. To see why the relation (37) holds, plug the expression (34) of θ^* into (33). We get $\lambda s(\varphi^*) = \Psi \mathbf{y} - \Psi \varphi^*$. Combining this with (36) (i.e., the uniqueness of $\Psi \varphi^*$) yields immediately (37).

Let us examine first the case where $|\mathcal{S}^c| = 0$. This is indeed equivalent to $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{I}$ and so, $\varphi^* = 0$. Would there exist another minimizer ξ^* of $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$, it should obey (37), which implies that ξ^* is necessarily equal to zero.

Now consider the case $|\mathcal{S}^c| > 0$.

Sufficiency. Assume that $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = |\mathcal{S}^c|$. As argued above, any two minimizers φ^* and ξ^* of $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$ obey (36)-(37). From (37) we get that $\mathcal{S} \subset \{t \in \mathbb{I} : \xi_t^* = 0\}$, which implies that $\mathcal{S}^c \supset \text{supp}(\xi^*)$. As a consequence, we can write (36) in the following reduced form $\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}(\varphi_{\mathcal{S}^c}^* - \xi_{\mathcal{S}^c}^*) = 0$. With $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = |\mathcal{S}^c|$, this implies that $\varphi^* = \xi^*$ and that the minimizer of $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$ is unique.

Necessity. Assume that $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c}) < |\mathcal{S}^c|$. Consider a nonzero vector $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\eta_{\mathcal{S}} = 0$ and $\eta_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{S}^c})$. Let $\eta_1 = \nu \eta$, with $\nu \neq 0$. It is straightforward to verify that $\Psi \varphi^* = \Psi(\varphi^* + \eta_1)$. Note that ν can be chosen sufficiently small such that φ_t^* and $\varphi_t^* + \eta_{1,t}$ have the same sign whenever $\varphi_t^* \neq 0$. Following a similar path as in the proof of Theorem 2, we can establish that $s(\varphi^*) = s(\varphi^* + \eta_1)$. Finally, with $\Psi \varphi^* = \Psi(\varphi^* + \eta_1)$, $s(\varphi^*) = s(\varphi^* + \eta_1)$ and the fact that φ^* is an optimal solution (hence satisfying (33)), it is easy to check that $\varphi^* + \eta_1$ also satisfies (33). By Lemma 3, $\varphi^* + \eta_1$ ($\neq \varphi^*$) solves (31). Hence, the solution is not unique.

Derivation of Eqs (34)-(34). These relations result from simple rearrangements of (32)-(33). $\square$

From Lemma 4, it appears that the true vector $\mathbf{f}$ can be found by problem (31) iff there is a vector $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $(\hat{\theta}, \mathbf{f})$ satisfies the conditions (i)-(ii) of Lemma 4. In particular, $(\hat{\theta}, \mathbf{f})$ must satisfy (33). A necessary condition for this is that $\Psi \mathbf{e} = \lambda s(\mathbf{f})$. And this implies that the

³It is to be noted that the analysis in [36] provides only a sufficient condition.

regularization parameter must verify $\lambda \geq \|\Psi \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ when $\mathbf{f} = 0$, and $\lambda = \|\Psi \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ when $\mathbf{f} \neq 0$. Note further that if $\mathbf{e} = 0$ and $\mathbf{f} \neq 0$, then λ must be equal to zero! However, if λ is set to zero in (31), then the solution set is

$$\left\{ (\theta, \varphi) : \theta = (X X^\top)^{-1} X(\mathbf{y} - \varphi), \varphi \in \mathbf{y} + \text{im}(X^\top) \right\}.$$

Since this set contains infinitely many elements, we conclude that it is unlikely to get exactly the true $\mathbf{f}$ by solving (31) irrespective of the value of the regularization parameter λ .

In any case, the estimation error can be bounded as follows.

Proposition 2. *Assume that the conditions of Lemma 4 are satisfied and denote with (θ^*, φ^*) the solution to problem (31). Then*

$$\|\theta^* - \theta^o\|_2 \leq (K_1 \varepsilon + \lambda K_2) + K_1 M \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{J} \cap \mathbb{I}^c(\theta^o)|}{|\mathcal{J}|}} \quad (38)$$

where $\varepsilon = \max_{t \in \mathbb{I}} |e_t|$, $M = \max_{t \in \mathbb{I}} |f_t|$,

$$K_1 = \max_{|J| \geq \nu_n(X)} \sqrt{|J|} \left\| (X X^\top)^{-1} (I_n + E_J + 2E_J^2 + E_J^3) X_J \right\|_2 \quad (39)$$

$$K_2 = \max_{|J| \geq \nu_n(X)} \sqrt{|J|} \left\| (X_J X_J^\top)^{-1} X_J \right\|_2 \quad (40)$$

with $E_J = (X_{J^c} X_{J^c}^\top)^{-1} (X_J X_J^\top)^{-1}$, $J \subset \mathbb{I}$. In (38) I_n is the identity matrix of order n ; the set $\mathcal{J}$ denotes the maximizing argument of (39) and $\mathbb{I}^c(\theta^o) = \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(\theta^o)$.

Proof. The idea of the proof consists in deriving first an expression of $\theta^* - \theta^o$ and then working out a bound on its norm. From (34) and the data model (1), we have

$$\theta^* = (X X^\top)^{-1} X \left(X^\top \theta^o + \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f} - \varphi^* \right)$$

This, by noting that $\varphi_S^* = 0$, can be written as

$$(X X^\top) (\theta^* - \theta^o) = X_S (\mathbf{e}_S + \mathbf{f}_S) + X_{S^c} (\mathbf{e}_{S^c} + \mathbf{f}_{S^c} - \varphi_{S^c}^*)$$

Using formula (35) and manipulating a little, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} (X X^\top) (\theta^* - \theta^o) = & \\ & \left[X_S - X_{S^c} (\Psi_{S^c}^\top \Psi_{S^c})^{-1} \Psi_{S^c}^\top \Psi_S \right] (\mathbf{e}_S + \mathbf{f}_S) \\ & + \lambda X_{S^c} (\Psi_{S^c}^\top \Psi_{S^c})^{-1} \Psi_{S^c}^\top s(\varphi^*). \end{aligned}$$

Further calculations using Woodbury's matrix identity and exploiting the relation $X s(\varphi^*) = 0$,

yield

$$(XX^\top)(\theta^* - \theta^o) = (I_n + E_S + 2E_S^2 + E_S^3) X_S (e_S + f_S) - \lambda(I + E) X_S s(\varphi_S^*)$$

with $E_S = (X_{S^c} X_{S^c}^\top) (X_S X_S^\top)^{-1}$. The result follows by multiplying with $(XX^\top)^{-1}$, remarking that $(XX^\top)^{-1} = (X_S X_S^\top)^{-1} (I_n + E_S)^{-1}$ and taking the euclidean norm. $\square$

It is interesting to notice that the numbers K_1 , K_2 and $|\mathcal{J}|$ depend solely on the data matrix X . Moreover, when the sequence $\{f_t\}$ contains only a few nonzero elements (but otherwise arbitrarily large), the last term in (38) is likely to vanish. As a consequence, even though the bound M can be large in principle, the bound on the estimation error can be kept at a reasonable level.

4 Extension to multivariable systems

We consider now the multivariable analogue of model (1) written in the form

$$y_t = A^o x_t + f_t + e_t, \quad (41)$$

where $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the output vector at time t , $\{f_t\} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is the sequence of errors, $\{e_t\} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is the noise sequence, $A^o \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the parameter matrix.

The question of interest is how to recover the matrix A^o from measurements corrupted by a vector sequence of sparse errors $\{f_t\}$. The sparse optimization approach is still applicable to this case, that is, we can formulate the estimation problem as

$$\underset{A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \left| \left\{ t : y_t - Ax_t \neq 0 \right\} \right| \quad (42)$$

with $|\cdot|$ standing for cardinality. It can be easily verified that Theorem 1 applies to (42) as well.

The convex relaxation takes the form of a nonsmooth optimization with a cost functional consisting of a sum-of-norms of errors [28, 10, 2],

$$\underset{A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{t=1}^N \|y_t - Ax_t\|_2 \quad (43)$$

with $\|\cdot\|_2$ referring to the Euclidean norm.

Theorem 6. *A matrix $A^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ solves the sum-of-norms problem (43), if and only if any of the following equivalent statements holds:*

T1. There exists a sequence of vectors $\{\beta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(A^*)} \subset \mathcal{B}_2(0, 1)$ such that

$$\sum_{t \notin \mathbb{I}^0(A^*)} v_t^* x_t^\top + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(A^*)} \beta_t x_t^\top = 0, \quad (44)$$

where $v_t^* = (y_t - A^*x_t)/\|y_t - A^*x_t\|_2$. Here, $\mathcal{B}_2(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is the Euclidean unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^m$.

T2. For any matrix $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$,

$$\left| \sum_{t \notin \mathbb{I}^0(A^*)} v_t^{*\top} \Lambda x_t \right| \leq \sum_{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(A^*)} \|\Lambda x_t\|_2. \quad (45)$$

T3. The optimal value of the problem

$$\min_{Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}} \|Z\|_{2,\infty} \text{ subject to } V^* X_{\mathbb{I}^c(A^*)}^\top = Z X_{\mathbb{I}^0(A^*)}^\top \quad (46)$$

$p = |\mathbb{I}^0(A^*)|$ and V^* being a matrix formed with the unit 2-norm vectors v_t^* , for $t \in \mathbb{I} \setminus \mathbb{I}^0(A^*)$,
is smaller than 1.

Moreover, the solution A^* is unique iff

T1'. (44) holds and $\text{rank}(X_{\mathcal{T}}) = n$ where $\mathcal{T} = \{t \in \mathbb{I}^0(A^*) : \|\beta_t\|_2 < 1\}$.

T2'. (45) holds with strict inequality symbol for all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\Lambda \neq 0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2. It is therefore omitted here. $\square$

It is interesting to note that based on Theorem 6, the analysis carried out in the previous sections can be easily generalized to the multivariable case. In particular, Proposition 1 and Theorems 3-5 can be restated for the multivariable model (41) with only some slight modifications. For illustration purpose, we just state below the multivariable counterpart of Theorem 3.

Theorem 7. Assume that the noise sequence $\{e_t\}$ in model (41) is identically equal to zero and that $\text{rank}(X) = n$.

- Let $k_3(X)$ be the minimum integer $k \in \mathbb{I}$ such that the optimal value of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{(I, I^c): |I|=k} \max_{V \in \mathbb{B}^{m \times |I^c|}} \min_{Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times |I|}} \|Z\|_{2,\infty} \\ \text{s.t. } X_{I^c} V^\top = X_I Z^\top \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbb{B}^{m \times q} = \{[b_1 \ \dots \ b_q] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}, b_i \in \mathcal{B}_2(0,1)\}$,
is less than or equal to one.

- Let $k_4(X)$ be the minimum integer $k \in \mathbb{I}$ such that

$$\max_{(I, I^c): |I|=k} \max_{\|B\|_{2,\text{col}}=1} \|BX^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} X_{I^c}\|_{2,\text{col}} \leq 1/2$$

where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times N}$.

Here the leftmost maximum is taken over all partitions (I, I^c) of $\mathbb{I}$.

If

$$|\mathbb{I}^0(A^o)| \geq \min(k_3(X), k_4(X))$$

then A^o solves (43).

Moreover, if the inequalities involved in the definitions of $k_3(X)$ and $k_4(X)$ are strict and $|\mathbb{I}^0(A^o)| \geq \nu_n(X)$, then A^o is the unique solution to problem (43).

Proof. The proof proceeds from the conditions (44) and (45) and follows a similar reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 3. $\square$

Remark 2 (Geometric median). In the special case where $n = 1$, the matrix A^o in (41) reduces to a vector $a^o \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Assuming $x_t = 1$ for all t , the problem (43) then becomes

$$\underset{a \in \mathbb{R}^m}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{t=1}^N \|y(t) - a\|_2. \quad (47)$$

This is the so-called geometric median problem.

By applying (45), we can see that a^o solves (47) if $|\mathbb{I}^0(a^o)|/N \geq 1/2$.


5 Numerical illustration

5.1 Static models subject to intermittent gross errors


In our first experiment we consider static linear and affine models of the form (1) with $n = 4$ and $N = 500$. The affine model refers to the case where the regressor x_t has the form $x_t = [\tilde{x}_t^\top \ 1]^\top$. The goal is to estimate the probability of exact recovery of the true parameter vector by problem (8) in function of the number of nonzero elements in the sequence $\{f_t\}$. For this purpose, the noise $\{e_t\}$ is set to zero. The nonzero elements of $\{f_t\}$ are drawn from a Gaussian distribution with mean 100 and variance 1000. For each level of sparsity (*i.e.*, proportion on nonzeros), a Monte Carlo simulation of size 100 is carried out with randomly generated static/affine models and 500 data samples at each run. Repeating this for four situations (linear/affine and linear/affine with positive f_t 's), we obtain the results depicted in Figure 1. We observe that in the linear case, problem (8) provides the true parameter vector when the output is affected by up to 80% of nonzero gross errors. This is because the data $\{x_t\}$ which were sampled from a Gaussian distribution are very generic. In the affine case, the performance is a little less good. If we set all f_t 's to have the same sign, then as suggested by condition (14), the percentage of outliers that can be corrected by the optimization problem (8) cannot exceed 50%.

5.2 Static models with both noise and gross errors

Consider now the case of static models of the form (1) in the presence of both $\{e_t\}$ and $\{f_t\}$ sampled from Gaussian distributions $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_e^2)$ and $\mathcal{N}(100, 1000)$ respectively. The variance σ_e^2 is




(a) Linear static model




(b) Affine static model

Figure 1: Estimates of probabilities of exact recovery when noise $\{e_t\}$ is equal to zero. From a numerical point of view, the recovery is said to be exact if $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^o\|_2 \leq 10^{-5}$ and inexact otherwise, $\hat{\theta}$ being the estimated parameter vector.




(a) Static model: SNR = 20 dB




(b) Static model: SNR = 10 dB

Figure 2: Average relative estimation error versus sparsity level.

selected so as to achieve a certain signal to noise ratio before the gross error sequence is added to the output. Again, by carrying out a Monte-Carlo simulation of size 100 with different sparsity levels and randomly generated models at each run, we obtain the average errors plotted in Figure 2. It turns out that the results returned by problems (8) and (31) with $\lambda = 0.10$ are almost the same for an SNR in $\{10 \text{ dB}, 20 \text{ dB}\}$. The performance can be assessed by comparing with an "oracle" estimate *i.e.*, the least squares estimate one would obtain if the locations of zeros in the sequence $\{f_t\}$ were known. The results in Figure 2 tend to suggest that the proposed approach performs very well. For the current numerical experiment, our results are very close to the ideal estimate when the proportion of nonzeros is less than 70%.



(a) Linear dynamic model



(b) Affine dynamic model

Figure 3: Estimates of probabilities of exact recovery when noise $\{e_t\}$ is equal to zero. Results of a Monte-Carlo simulation of size 100 with randomly generated linear ARX systems of order $n_a = n_b = 2$.

5.3 Dynamic linear models subject to sensor intermittent faults

In the case when (1) represents a dynamic ARX model subject to gross errors, it can be observed (see Fig. 3) that the probabilities of exact recovery are much smaller than in the static case studied in Section 5.1. This difference is related to the richness (or genericity) of the regression vectors (columns of X) involved in each case. In the static example above, the vectors $\{x_t\}$ are freely sampled in any direction of $\mathbb{R}^n$ by following a Gaussian distribution. In the dynamic system case however, the data vectors $\{x_t\}$ constructed as in (3) are constrained to lie on a manifold. As a result, the data matrix X generated by the dynamic system is less generic. According to conditions of the paper, and (26) in particular, there is a threshold depending on the richness of the data such that exact recovery is guaranteed whenever the number of zero entries in $\mathbf{f}$ is larger than this threshold. So, the more generic the data contained in X are, the more outliers can be removed by problem (8). Note that the lack of sufficient genericity can be compensated (to some extent) by implementing the iterative sparsity enhancing technique (ℓ_1 reweighted algorithm) described in Section 3.1. This leads, for only two iterations, to significantly improved results as represented in Figure 4.

5.4 Numerical evaluation of sufficient bounds

This subsection presents a numerical evaluation of the estimates of number of outliers that can be corrected by the nonsmooth optimization-based estimator. Note that the numbers $k_i(X)$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$ from Theorems 3 and 7 are hard to compute numerically because this would require a combinatorial optimization. Therefore we just compare those bounds which are easier to compute. More specifically, three sufficient thresholds are compared:

- The bound $1/(2r(X))$ obtained in Theorem 4.




Figure 4: Estimates of probabilities of exact recovery by reweighted ℓ_1 minimization when noise $\{e_t\}$ is equal to zero. Results of a Monte-Carlo simulation of size 100 with randomly generated linear ARX systems with orders $n_a = n_b = 2$.

- A normalized version of this bound $1/(2r_n(X))$ with

$$r_n(X) = \max_{t,k} \frac{|x_k^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} x_t|}{\|x_k\|_{\Sigma_X} \cdot \|x_t\|_{\Sigma_X}},$$

where $\|x\|_{\Sigma_X} = \sqrt{x^\top \Sigma_X^{-1} x}$, $\Sigma_X = XX^\top$. Indeed $r_n(X)$ equals $r(X)$ in the case when all the regressors $\{x_t\}$ are normalized to have unit $\|x\|_{\Sigma_X}$ -norm. Note that this definition of the bound applies to a weighted version of the objective function in (8), namely $\sum_{t=1}^N 1/\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_X} |y_t - \theta^\top x_t|$.

- The mutual coherence-based bound $1/2(1 + 1/\mu(P_X))$ with $P_X = I_N - X^\top (XX^\top)^{-1} X$ obtained in [5, 1]. Here μ represents the mutual coherence.

Figure 5 compares the sufficient thresholds in the case of static data drawn from a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_3)$. Figure 6 compares the same thresholds for dynamic data in the form (3). The generating system in this case is an ARX model defined by $y_t = -0.40y_{t-1} + 0.25y_{t-2} - 0.15u_{t-1}$ and driven by a normally distributed input sequence. In all cases, the data matrix X is normalized so as to have unit 2-norm columns before being processed. The plots in Figure 5 and Figure 6 draw the average values obtained over 100 independent runs. The results suggest three interesting facts :

- All the bounds are very loose that is, they largely underestimate the number of admissible gross errors. For example Figure 1 shows that exact recovery can be achieved in the face a relatively large proportion (more than 70%) of corrupted data while the sufficient bounds in 5 indicate a value around 16. The bounds involving the numbers $k_i(X)$ are likely to be tighter but they are much more challenging to compute numerically.
- The normalized r_n -based bound tend to provide a better bound; the other two provide very

close bounds particularly when the number of samples is large.

- As could be intuitively expected, the dynamic data generated by a linear system are less generic. The bounds obtained in this case are smaller. The question as to which type of dynamic system can generate more generic data is open.

Note that all the proposed sufficient conditions are functions of the regressor matrix X only and they are stated as bounds on the number of zeros or nonzeros in the sequence $\{f_t\}$. One can expect to gain a substantial improvement by taking explicitly into account the information relative to the sign of the f_t 's just as done in the case of affine models (see Eq. (14)).




Figure 5: Comparison of sufficient bounds on the number of gross errors for exact recovery : static data drawn from a Gaussian distribution.




Figure 6: Comparison of sufficient bounds on the number of gross errors for exact recovery : dynamic data generated by an ARX model.

6 Conclusion

In this paper we have discussed the potential of nonsmooth convex optimization for addressing the problem of robust estimation. Considering in particular the problem of inferring an unknown parameter vector from measurements which are subject to possibly unbounded gross errors, we showed that an exact recovery is possible regardless of the number of gross errors provided

certain conditions of genericity hold. The conditions for exact recovery are essentially sufficient conditions. Simulations results reveal that the proposed conditions are conservative. Concerning the identification problem, future work will consider the problem of designing the excitation of a dynamic system so as to achieve such genericity conditions on the regressor matrix.

References

- [1] L. Bako. Identification of switched linear systems via sparse optimization. *Automatica*, 47:668–677, 2011.
- [2] L. Bako, V. L. Le, F. Lauer, and G. Bloch. Identification of MIMO switched state-space systems. In *American Control Conference, Washington DC, USA*, 2013.
- [3] L. Bako and S. Lecoeuche. A sparse optimization approach to state observer design for switched linear systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 62:143–151, 2013.
- [4] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [5] A. M. Bruckstein, D. L. Donoho, and M. Elad. From sparse solutions of systems of equations to sparse modeling of signals and images. *SIAM Review*, 51:34–81, 2009.
- [6] E. Candès and P. A. Randall. Highly robust error correction by convex programming. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54:2829–2840, 2006.
- [7] E. Candès and T. Tao. Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51:4203–4215, 2005.
- [8] E. J. Candès, M. Wakin, and S. Boyd. Enhancing sparsity by reweighted ℓ_1 minimization. *Journal Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 14:877–905, 2008.
- [9] E. J. Candès and M. B. Wakin. An introduction to compressive sampling. *IEEE Signal Processing Society*, 25:21–30, 2008.
- [10] D. Chen, L. Bako, and S. Lecoeuche. A recursive sparse learning method: Application to jump markov linear systems. In *18th IFAC World Congress, Milano, Italy*, 2011.
- [11] X. Chen and W. Zhou. Convergence of reweighted ℓ_1 minimization algorithms and unique solution of truncated ℓ_p minimization. *Technical Report*, 2010.
- [12] D. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, Apr. 2006.
- [13] D. L. Donoho and M. Elad. Optimal sparse representation in general (nonorthogonal) dictionaries via ℓ_1 minimization. *The Proceedings of National Academy of Science*, 100:2197–2202, 2003.

- [14] D. L. Donoho and P. J. Huber. *The notion of breakdown point*, pages 157–184. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1983.
- [15] H. Fawzi, P. Tabuada, and S. Diggavi. Secure estimation and control for cyber-physical systems under adversarial attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59:1454–1467, 2014.
- [16] A. Garulli, S. Paoletti, and A. Vicino. A survey on switched and piecewise affine system identification. In *IFAC Symposium on System Identification, Brussels, Belgium*, 2012.
- [17] M. Grant and S. Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 1.2 (june 2009, build 711).
- [18] F. R. Hampel. A general qualitative definition of robustness. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42:1887–1896, 1971.
- [19] P. J. Huber. The place of l_1 -norm in robust estimation. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 5:255–262, 1987.
- [20] P. J. Huber and E. M. Ronchetti. *Robust Statistics*. A. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Publication (2nd Ed), 2009.
- [21] F. Lauer, G. Bloch, and R. Vidal. A continuous optimization framework for hybrid system identification. *Automatica*, 47:608–613, 2011.
- [22] V. L. Le, F. Lauer, and G. Bloch. Selective ℓ_1 minimization for sparse recovery. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59:3008–3013, 2014.
- [23] L. Ljung. *System Identification: Theory for the user (2nd Ed.)*. PTR Prentice Hall., Upper Saddle River, USA, 1999.
- [24] R. A. Maronna, R. D. Martin, and V. J. Yohai. *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006.
- [25] I. Maruta and T. Sugie. Identification of PWA models via data compression based on ℓ_1 optimization. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference, Orlando, FL, USA*, 2011.
- [26] Y. Nesterov. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*. Springer, 2004.
- [27] H. Ohlsson and L. Ljung. Identification of switched linear regression models using sum-of-norms regularization. *Automatica*, 49:1045–1050, 2013.
- [28] H. Ohlsson, L. Ljung, and S. Boyd. Segmentation of ARX-models using sum-of-norms regularization. *Automatica*, 46:1107–1111, 2010.

- [29] N. Ozay and M. Sznaier. Hybrid system identification with faulty measurements and its application to activity analysis. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference, Orlando, FL, USA*, 2011.
- [30] N. Ozay, M. Sznaier, C. Lagoa, and O. Camps. A sparsification approach to set membership identification of a class of affine hybrid systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57:634–648, 2012.
- [31] S. Paoletti, A. Juloski, G. Ferrari-Trecate, and R. Vidal. Identification of hybrid systems: A tutorial. *European Journal of Control*, 13:242–260, 2007.
- [32] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1996.
- [33] P. J. Rousseeuw. Least median of squares regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79:871–880, 1984.
- [34] P. J. Rousseeuw and A. M. Leroy. *Robust Regression and Outlier Detection*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2005.
- [35] T. Soderstrom and P. Stoica. *System identification*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, USA, 1989.
- [36] R. J. Tibshirani. The lasso problem and uniqueness. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:1456–1490, 2013.
- [37] R. Vidal, S. Soatto, Y. Ma, and S. Sastry. An algebraic geometric approach to the identification of a class of linear hybrid systems. In *Conference on Decision and Control, Maui, Hawaii, USA*, 2003.
- [38] Y.-B. Zhao and D. Li. Reweighted ℓ_1 -minimization for sparse solutions to underdetermined linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22:1065–1088, 2012.